UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,665	09/30/2003	Philippe Dichl	003921.00139	2038

22907 7590 09/10/2007

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1100 13th STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER	
CHRISS, ANDREW W	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2616	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
09/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/673,665	DIEHL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew Chriss	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 August 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,9-14 and 20-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,9-14 and 20-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/24/2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Claims 1-4, 9-14, and 20-24 in the reply filed on 8/6/2007 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. **Claims 2-4 and 10-14** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claims 2-4, the term "the message formation and send block" lacks antecedent basis in Claim 1.

Regarding Claims 10-14, the term "the message receive and disassembly block" lacks antecedent basis in Claim 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. **Claims 1-3, 9-13, and 20-24** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reblewski et al (United States Patent 6,265,894), hereinafter Reblewski, in view of Kappler et al (United States Patent 6,064,677), hereinafter Kappler.

Regarding Claims 1 and 9, Reblewski teaches a reconfigurable integrated circuit for use in an emulation system (column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 2). However, Reblewski does not teach a storage unit comprising a signal inclusion schedule or circuitry operative to generate and transmit a message. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler teaches a calendar queue mechanism for scheduling transport of units or cells, specifically high frequency/high priority flows and low frequency/low priority flows (column 12, line 65 – column 13, line 10). Further, Kappler teaches a set of transmit lists 65, connected to calendar queue 63 (Figure 3), which generate and transmit the messages released by the calendar queue (column 11, lines 25-30). As mentioned above, the calendar queue specifies the frequency of the signals to include. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit

taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms.

Regarding Claims 2 and 10, Reblewski and Kappler teach all of the limitations of Claims 1 and 9, as described above. However, Reblewski does not teach signals determined to be more critical transmitted more frequently. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler further teaches flows having different frequencies are prioritized so that the data transport units of the higher frequency flows are given transmit priority over any data transport units of lower frequency flows with which they happen to collide (column 12, lines 30-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms.

Regarding Claim 3 and 12, Reblewski and Kappler teach all of the limitations of Claims 1 and 9, as described above. However, Reblewski does not teach generating and transmitting a message in a plurality of clock cycles of an operating clock independent of an emulation clock. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler further teaches that the calendar queue 63 implements a stalled virtual clock so that cells that are scheduled for transmission are leased for transmission only when system "real time" has reached their respective scheduled transmission times (column 11, lines 21-25). Therefore, messages are generated in a plurality of clock cycles of an operating clock independent of the predetermined rate of the overall system clock (column 8, lines 53-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation

integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms.

Regarding Claim 11, Reblewski and Kappler teach all of the limitations of Claim 9, as described above. However, Reblewski does not teach the message comprising state values. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler teaches that each outbound message contain VP and VC identifiers (Figure 2), equivalent to Applicant's disclosed state value (Figure 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms.

Regarding Claim 13, Reblewski and Kappler teach all of the limitations of Claim 9, as described above. However, Reblewski does not teach extracting a parity value from a message. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler teaches reading a CRC (parity) value from an inbound cell (Figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms.

Regarding Claim 20, Reblewski teaches an integrated circuit for use in an emulation system, as described with regards to Claims 1 and 9. Reblewski further teaches multiple reconfigurable logic resources (Figure 2), output pins 113, and a partial scan register that receives a plurality of output signals from logic elements (column lines 6-15), equivalent to

Applicant's claimed message formation and send block. However, Reblewski does not teach a signal inclusion schedule. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler teaches a signal inclusion schedule, as discussed with regards to Claims 1 and 9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms.

Regarding Claim 21, Reblewski teaches an input pin 113. Reblewski further teaches a logic element that receives multiple inputs and outputs a single signal (truth table 202). However, Reblewski does not teach the claimed message receive and disassembly block nor the signal inclusion schedule. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler teaches a switching fabric that decomposes cells into four bit wide "nibbles" for arbitration and routing (column 10, lines 7-13), equivalent to Applicant's claimed message received and disassembly block. Kappler further teaches a signal inclusion schedule, as discussed with regards to Claims 1 and 9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms.

Regarding Claim 22, Reblewski teaches a plurality of output pins 113. Further, Reblewski teaches an array of reconfigurable integrated circuits in Figure 10, thereby teaching multiple partial scan registers.

Regarding Claim 23, Reblewski teaches an array of reconfigurable integrated circuits in Figure 10, thereby teaching a plurality of reconfigurable logic resources in communication with the message formation and send block.

Regarding Claim 24, Reblewski teaches an integrated circuit for use in an emulation system, as described with regards to Claims 1, 9, and 20. Reblewski further teaches multiple reconfigurable logic resources (Figure 2) and input pins 113. However, Reblewski does not teach the claimed message receive and disassembly block nor the signal inclusion schedule. In the same field of endeavor, Kappler teaches a switching fabric that decomposes cells into four bit wide "nibbles" for arbitration and routing (column 10, lines 7-13), equivalent to Applicant's claimed message received and disassembly block. Kappler further teaches a signal inclusion schedule, as discussed with regards to Claims 1 and 9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the scheduling and transmission taught in Kappler on the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski in order to reduce relative data transport unit delay variations in time-multiplexed outputs from output queued routing mechanisms.

7. **Claims 4 and 14** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reblewski in view of Kappler as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Sindhushayana et al (United States Patent Application Publication US 2003/0053435 A1), hereinafter Sindhushayana. Reblewski and Kappler teach all of the limitations of Claims 1 and 13, as discussed above. However, the references do not teach a parity bit generator. In the same field of endeavor, Sindhushayana teaches a channel interleaver that permutes systematic bits with

parity bits, thus generating a parity value and transmitting a message containing a parity value. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the parity value generator taught in Sindhushayana with the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit taught in Reblewski, as modified above, in order to employ an error correction system that overcomes the impact of interference in a wireless system.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Huang (United States Patent 5,563,829) is directed to multi-port memory emulation using tag registers.

b. Nakaya (United States Patent Application Publication US 2001/0052793 A1) is directed to a reconfigurable device having programmable interconnect network suitable for implementing data paths.

c. Oskouy et al (United States Patent 5,625,625) is directed to a method and apparatus for partitioning data load and unload functions within an interface system for use with an ATM system. Specifically, Oskouy et al teach scheduling certain connections more often than others, based on respective data rates.

d. Brown et al (United States Patent 5,896,380) is directed to scheduling critical cells in an ATM system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Chriss whose telephone number is 571-272-1774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrew Chriss
Examiner
Art Unit 2616

AC

CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600